

Bristol Quakerism Expos'd:

SHEWING

The Fallacy, Perversion, Ignorance,
and Error of

Benjamin Cool,

THE

Quakers Chief Preacher

At *BRISTOL*,

And of his Followers and Abettors There, Discovered in His, and Their Late Book, falsely called, *Sophistry Detected: Or, an Answer to GEORGE KEITH's Synopsis*: Wherein also both his *Deisme*, and Inconsistency with himself, and his Brethren, with respect to the peculiar Principles of Christianity, are plainly Demonstrated.

By **GEORGE KEITH.**

LONDON,

Printed for John Gwillim, over-against *Crosby-Square*, in
Bishopsgate-Street, 1700.

Smith's Quarterly Review

The Talley, Perfection, Ignorance
and Error of

Superiority

THE

Quarterly Review

At Bristol

of the following Authors:—
The Talley, Perfection, Ignorance
and Error of Superiority, by
George Talley, Esq., of the Middle Temple,
and his
of Christianity, by George Talley, Esq.

By George Talley, Esq.

Printed for J. Talley, over the entrance of the
Library, No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

Bristol Quakerism Expos'd, &c.

PASSING by *Benjamin Cool's* False and Unchristian Accusations against me, for which he gives no Proof, of my *Envy, Malice, Pride, &c.* I shall first of all briefly take notice of his **Threefold Charge** against me, in his Preface Page 3. &c.

First, *That the Design of my Synopsis, which he saith is the substance of all my late Writings against them Contracted, is to render the Quakers such as disown the Authority of the Holy Scriptures.*

Secondly, *That the promised Messiah there Testified of, who was Born of the Virgin, was not the Son of God.* [He should have added, Properly.]

Thirdly, *That the History of Christs Incarnation, &c. is not necessary to our Salvation. These, saith he, are the three grand Pillars on which his whole Fabrick stands, &c. And these, he saith, are so many palpable Untruths.*

Answer, That these three are the Substance of all my late Writings against them, is a false Assertion; for I have Proved many other things against them in my late Writings, that are as Substantial as any of those Three; but that I may not Digress, I shall wave that part at present, and shall allow my Adversary, that these three mentioned by him, are very great and considerable, which I Charge all the *Quakers* to be Guilty of, who own the Books of the *Quakers* Teachers and Authors Quoted by me, to give a true account of their Faith and Perswasions: And particularly I charge *William Pen*, as well as *George Whitehead*, to be guilty of all the Three, and *Benjamin Cool* as much as any of them.

Now let us see how *Benjamin Cool* defends *William Pen* from being guilty of my Charge, with respect to these three things.

My First Charge against *William Pen*, and his Brethren, is, *That he disowns the Authority of the Holy Scriptures.* The Reasons of this Charge I gave in my *Synopsis*, particularly in *Art. 1.* where I bring in *William Pen* arguing against the Scriptures being the General Rule of Faith, and Life, *Because all Men have not the Scripture, and because of their Uncertainty (unless upon the ground of Inward Extraordinary Revelation) and for their Imperfection; and many other Reasons given by him in the following Pages, [viz. of his Discourse of the General Rule of Faith, and Life]* to the number of about Fourteen, all which 14 Reasons I Printed in my Late Book, called, *The Deism of William Pen, and his Brethren*, Printed in the Year 1699. And gave Answers particularly to every one of them, to which I refer my Reader. [Such as desire to have the said Book, may Buy it at the *Three Pigeons*, against the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhill, London.*] Where I do not blame *William Pen* for asserting, That the Scriptures are not the General Rule to all Mankind of Faith and Practice, for I know none who ever said they were; but I blame him for Asserting, *That all Mankind have one General Rule of Faith and Practice*, to wit, of equal Extent and Latitude to Heathens and Christians.

And in Page 28 of that Book, called, *The Deism of William Pen, &c.* I shew, *That he ought to have distinguished between the General Law, or Rule of Justice, given to all Mankind, and the superadded Law, and Rule of Christian Faith and Practice, given in general to Christians.* Now, that I charge *William Pen* with holding the Scriptures to be Uncertain (unless upon the ground of Inward Extraordinary Revelation) What saith B. Cool in his Defence? *Because*, saith he, Page 4. *W. Pen saith the Scriptures are Uncertain, as to Number, since many Writings are lost, &c. He would render us denyers of the Certainty of the Matter therein contained; than which nothing is more untrue.*

Note, Reader, The falshood and dull Sophistry of B. Cool, as if my Charge against *W. Pen* were mainly grounded upon his saying *The Scriptures were Uncertain as to the Number, since*
 many

many Writings are Lost, &c. whereas I do not make use of that Argument against him, as my Only, or Chiefest, either in my *Synopsis*, or my Book called *Deisme*; for having diligently searched both, cannot find it in the *Synopsis* at all, and but very transiently in my Book of *Deisme*. If B. Cool thinks to help himself, from being guilty of Falshood, and false Quotation, by Concealing the principal part of the Truth, by his addition of &c. that will but the more discover his disingenuity. I shall therefore for the Readers Satisfaction, to clear my Innocency, and detect both W. Pen's Guilt in his most Unchristian way of Arguing against the Scriptures Authority, and their being the Rule of Faith and Practice to Christians; and also B. Cool's sordid and deceitful way of defending him, Quote some places out of W. Pen's general Discourse of the Rule of Faith and Practice, and which I have very fully Quoted in my Book of *Deisme*.

In his 13th Page of his Discourse aforesaid, W. Pen thus Argueth against the Scriptures being the Rule so much as to Christians: *They are not in the Original, because that is not extant; nor in the Copies, because there are Thirty and above in number, and 'tis Undetermin'd, and, for ought we see, saith he, Undeterminable. And the variety of Readings amongst those Copies, amount to several Thousands; and if the Copies cannot, how can the Translations be the Rule? And then Argueth against their being the Rule, from divers of the Books of Scripture, because Rejected by some, and Received by others.*

Concerning which way of W. Pen's Arguing against the Scriptures being the Rule, I say, in my Book of *Deisme*, Pag 70. *All which Pleas, both of Deists, and Papists, have been abundantly Answered by Protestant Writers. See Dr. Tillotson's Book, called, The Rule of Faith; in Answer to J. S. a Papist, whose Arguments against the Scriptures being the Rule of Faith, are so much of the same sort with these here of W. Pen's, as if he had taken them from him.*

Again, in his Page 26, he thus proceeds. *The Scriptures are not the Rule of Faith, and Life, because they cannot be the Rule in their*

their Translations. Supposing the Ancient Copies were Exact, it cannot be the Rule to far the greatest part of Mankind: Indeed, saith he, to none but Learned Men, which neither answers the Promise relating to Gospel times, which is Universal, nor the Necessity of all Mankind, for a Rule of Faith and Life.

I leave it to Impartial Readers, whether the Quotations above given, recited faithfully by me, out of *W. Pen's Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Practice*; and also out of my Book of *Deisme*, against *W. Pen*, of which Book my *Synopsis* was but a sort of *Index*, do not sufficiently prove *W. Pen's* Undervaluing the Authority of the Scriptures, for their want of Certainty, unless upon the ground of *Inward Extraordinary Revelation*, as I did particularly express it, both in my Book of *Deism* and *Synopsis*: And it could be nothing but a wilful omission in *B. Cool* not to take notice of those Passages above cited; For suppose he had not known of my Book of *Deisme* against *W. Pen*, yet he could not be Ignorant, that there was such a Book as *W. Pen's Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Practice*, out of which I had taken my abovesaid Quotations.

But for a further Evidence, that *W. Pen*, in his said Discourse, did Argue against the Certainty of the Matter contain'd in the Scriptures, with respect to the chief peculiar Doctrines of Christianity, as the Orthodox Faith of the Holy Trinity, against the *Arians* and *Socinians*, and the Orthodox Faith of all sound Protestants, against the Papists, about Transubstantiation, I Quote him at large in my Book of *Deisme*, Arguing in his Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Practice thus, pag 41, 42. *Is there any place [in Scripture] tells us (saith W. Pen) without Interpretation, whether the Socinian, or Trinitarian be in the right, in their differing apprehensions of the Three that bear record, &c. Also the Homousian and Arian, about Christ's Divinity, or the Papists and Protestants about Transubstantiation. If then things are left Undefin'd, and Undetermin'd, I mean Literally, and Expressly in the Scripture; and that the*
Question

Question arises about the Sense of Words, doth the Scripture determine which of these Interpreters hit the mark? Thus far *W. Pen.* From all which he concludes, That not the Scripture, but the Interpretation must decide the matter in Controversie; and that Interpretation must be given, not by the Scripture so much as Instrumentally, but from the Spirit of God [by Extraordinary Revelation] to be a True and Infallible Interpretation; and yet that extraordinary Revelation is not necessary to be given to any of the *Quakers* (as *W. Pen* confesseth) nor is given to them, as will after appear from what follows to be Quoted out of him.

Judge, Reader, doth not *W. Pen* here make the Matter of the Scripture Uncertain, with respect to these great matters of Christianity, the Orthodox Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and the denial of Transubstantiation, without inward extraordinary Revelation; and yet *B. Cool* is so shameless, to blame me, for saying, The *Quakers* deny the Certainty of the Matter contained in the Scripture, than which (he saith) nothing is more untrue.

Now if *B. Cool* thinks he, or his Brethren, have any particular extraordinary Revelation, to determine the Truth of the Matter concerning these great Articks of the Trinity, and denial of Transubstantiation, let him Assert it, and next let him Prove it, otherwise we have no reason to believe him, or them; but their asserting it is sufficient argument to prove my Charge against them, and particularly against *W. Pen*, That the Matter of Scripture, with respect to the chief and principal Doctrines of Christianity, is uncertain to Men, without extraordinary inward Revelation; whereby he means such as the Prophets and Apostles had without Scripture.

But for a further Confirmation that *B. Cool* is a false Accuser of me, in this very particular, and that I am unjustly charged by him, I have in my Book, called, *The Deisme of W. Pen*, brought Fourteen of *W. Pen's* Arguments out of his Discourse

course of the General Rule of Faith and Practice ; to all, and every one of which, I have particularly Answered. Whereby *W. Pen* Essayeth to prove, That the Scripture is not the Rule of Faith and Practice to Christians. One of which is from their Imperfection ; another, from their Uncertainty ; a third, from their Obscurity. And in his 10th Page, he Argues against the Scriptures being the Rule, *That a Rule ought to be Plain, Proper, and Intelligible*, which he pleads the Scriptures are not.

Now, I say, *W. Pen*, and his Brethren, yea, and *B. Cool* with them, disown the Authority of the Scriptures, because they deny them to be the Rule of Faith and Practice, to wit, the primary Rule of Faith and Practice, with respect to all things Commanded us to be Believ'd or Practis'd. For as concerning the Heathens, who have not the Scripture, I know none who Asserts that the Scripture is a Rule to them.

But that not only *W. Pen*, but *B. Cool*, is guilty in asserting the Scriptures not to be so much as the Rule in part to Christians who have the Scriptures, we have his plain Confession, page 4 of his Preface, where he concludes, but by a false Syllogism, *That there is but one General Rule, both to them who have the Scriptures, i. e. profess'd Christians, and to them who have them not, viz. the Heathens.* The word *But* in that place is Exclusive of the Scriptures being the Rule any more to profess'd Christians than to Heathens, seeing, by his Argument, both have *but* one Rule, which he would have to follow from some of my words he quotes ; but he infers his Conclusion by a false Syllogisme, which is this, *If (saith B. Cool) the Scripture cannot be savingly Believed and Understood but by the Revelation and Inward Illumination of the Spirit, then the Spirit is the primary Rule, even for Believing the Scriptures themselves ; but the first is true, therefore the last.*

The Consequence of his first Proposition is false, the falshood of which can be Demonstrated by the like false and fallacious Argument following ; *If a Bricklayer, Joyner, or Carpenter cannot see to work their Trades without Light, therefore the*
the

the Light is the Rule whereby they Work, either Primary, or Secondary. But the falsity of this is apparent ; for none ever thought that the Light either of Sun, Moon, or Candle, is the Rule, either Primary, or Secondary, whereby Tradesmen, as Bricklayers, Joyners, or Carpenters do Work ; for the Rule, or Rules whereby they Work, are one thing ; and the Light which lets them See how to use their Rule, is another thing : Or as if *B. Cool* should Argue, the Grindstone makes the Knife or Razor sharp, therefore the Grindstone is more sharp than both, or is Primarily sharp, and the Knife or Razor sharp but Secondly. This Example I only use to shew the fallhood of that Maxim applied in the Case, That for which a thing is such, that thing is the more such. But to Argue, That the Spirit is the Rule, because the Spirit enlightens and inables true Christians to understand the Scriptures, is as Weak and Sophistical, as to argue, because a Bricklayer teacheth a Man that is his Apprentice, to lay the Bricks upon a Wall, that therefore the Bricklayer is the Rule ; whereas the Bricklayer is not the Rule to the Apprentice, but his Rule and Master. And to Affirm, That the Spirit is the Rule, is to confound the Agent with the Instrument by which he works ; and is as great nonsense, as to make the Bricklayer to be the wooden Rule, and Line, and Plummert by which he works. And the like Fallacy have all his other Arguments, whereby he would infer, from some of my words he quotes out of my former Books, That I held there was *but* one General Rule, both to profess'd Christians and Heathens ; and Consequently, that if this proves *William Pen* guilty of *Deisme*, it equally (as *B. Cool* infers) proves *G. Keith* guilty of the same. But I deny his Consequence, for I do not remember that ever I so Asserted, or Argued, as *W. Pen* hath done, or as *B. Cool* now doth, That professed Christians and Heathens have *but* one General Rule.

But whereas, in some of my former Writings, I had dropt some Unwary and Unsound Expressions, in calling the Spirit, with respect to the peculiar Principle of Christianity, *The Prin-*

cial Rule, yet I deny that this proves me guilty of *Deisme*; seeing to the best of my knowledge and remembrance, I never made the Professed Christians and the Heathens, to have *but* one General Rule of Faith and Practice; for I always distinguished betwixt the common Illumination of the Spirit given to Heathens and all Mankind, and the special given to true Christians, in the use of the Written Word; which being two differing things, tho' both coming from one Author, sufficiently clears me, that I was never a *Deist*, whatever lesser Errors, or Mistakes I had when amongst the *Quakers*.

But hath *B. Cool* forgot the Proverb, *That two Blacks makes not one White*; suppose *G. K.* dropt some unwary Expressions, that, contrary to his intentions, did favour *Deisme*, will that excuse *W. Pen* of his *Deisme*, or *B. Cool*, and the *Quakers* of their *Deisme*, which can be prov'd, not barely from a few indeliberate Expressions dropt from their Pens, but from whole Books and Volumes they have filled with meer *Deist* Notions, striking at all the Foundations of Christianity, special and peculiar thereunto?

And I have this Advantage of *W. Pen*, and all others of his Brethren, That not only in my Book of Retractions, I have Retracted and Corrected many things, both in Particular, and in General, whatever I have Said, or Writ contrary to the Holy Scripture, but none of Them have done any such thing in the least; but also in Particular, in my Book, called, *The Deisme of W. Pen, and his Brethren*, page 4. I have Corrected my Mistake and Error, in calling (in some of my former Books) *The Spirits Inward Evidence, sealing to the truth of the peculiar Doctrines of Christianity contained in the Scripture, the Principal Rule of Faith*. Which I thus did correct, *That the Spirits Inward Evidence was not the Rule of Faith at all, to us Christians, but the principal objective Medium, or Motive of Credibility*.

And I having thus Retracted my Errors, and Corrected the same, before I either Publish'd, or Writ my *Synopsis*, and consequently long before *B. Cool* writ his pretended Answer to it,
he

he has dealt most Unfairly and Disingenuously with me, to Charge me with what I have Ingenuously and Fairly Retracted : And the same Answer may serve to all the other Quotations he brings out of my Books, to set me as deep in the Mire of *Deisme*, as *W. Pen*, or himself ; which had I been as guilty as they, is no vindication to them. And but that it would be an improper Digression, and too much divert the Reader, I could easily shew, that none of all his Quotations out of my former Books, prove me guilty of *Deisme*.

But seeing I have Retracted, both in Particular and General, what did seem, tho' but remotely and indirectly, to favour any unsound Notions about the Rule of the Christian Faith ; and have in my *Catechisme*, both Larger and Lesser, Asserted *The Holy Scriptures to be the only Rule of Faith and Practise, to all Christians, with respect to all the peculiar Articles of the Christian Faith, and to all the positive Precepts peculiarly belonging to the Christian Religion* : Therefore I appeal to all Impartial Readers, whether *B. Cool*, and his *Bristol Brethren*, who approve of his Book, are not highly Injurious to me ? Even as much, as if some *Romanist* should charge all the Popish Errors upon *Luther*, after he had Renounced them ; or suppose upon some *Quaker* that had formerly been a *Papist*, as I suppose *B. Cool* knoweth some of the *Quakers* to have been.

But the distinction of *Primary* and *Secondary* Rule, used by *W. Pen* and *B. Cool*, will not do, to defend them from *Deisme*, as I have shewed in my Book of *Deisme*, page 56. *W. Pen* is so seemingly kind to the Scriptures, that he grants them to be a Subordinate, Secondary, and Declaratory Rule, in his Discourse of the General Rule, page 25. *Such a Subordinate, Secondary, and Declaratory Rule* (saith he) *we never said several parts were not*. Observe, Reader, he will not allow all the parts of Scripture, but only some parts of it, to be so much as a Subordinate, Secondary, and Declaratory Rule. Though even the Ceremonial Precepts, he has as great reason to believe them to be the Word of God, and consequently a Rule of

Faith (tho' not of Practise) to us, as truly as any other parts of Scripture.

That the Scriptures are not a Subordinate and Secondary Rule (as both *W. Pen* and *B. Cool* have affirmed them to be) but the Primary and Only Rule, with respect to all the peculiar Doctrines and Precepts of the Christian Religion, I have clearly and fully prov'd, in my Book of *Deisme*, page 56, 57. The substance of what I have there said, I shall here transcribe as followeth.

Seeing every Subordinate and Secondary Rule presupposeth a Primary Rule, which hath no dependency on the Secondary; tho' the Secondary is wholly from the Primary, as the Transcript is wholly from the Original, but the Original is intirely compleat and perfect without the Copy, or Transcript. It is evident, that according to him, (viz. W. Pen) he hath all what he thinketh to be a Divine Knowledge and Faith, wholly from his Primary Rule, and nothing from the Scriptures, which he calls the Secondary; for the excellency of the Primary Rule is, that it teacheth all that is to be Divinely Known, or Believ'd, without the need or help of any Secondary Rule, otherwise it should not be Primary, nor should the Scriptures, in that case, be a Subordinate Rule, but Co-ordinate, and of equal Dignity, Necessity, and Use, with what he calls the Primary: For whatever is a primary, full, adequate and perfect Rule, such as he will have only the Light Within; or by whatever other Name he defines it, it must propose to him, all the Credenda and Agenda, i. e. all things he ought to Believe and Practise, without any other Rule whatsoever.

Surely as he who hath the Original, has no need of the Copy, nor great use of it for himself, so if W. Pen hath such a perfect, compleat, primary Rule, that teacheth him without Scripture, all that he ought to Know, Believe, or Practise, I cannot understand of what great use the Scripture can be unto him; or at least it is of no necessity to him, this primary Rule [The Light Within] hath taught him all before hand, otherwise it is not primary.

This Argument I have produc'd against *W. Pen*, is of equal force against *B. Cool*, and his *Bristol Brethren*, and the *Quakers* in

in general, who affirm they have this Primary Rule, and are come to be Taught by it *whatever* is to be known of God; as *W. Pen*, in his Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Practise, p. 21. affirmeth; and giveth for his proof, that place in *Rom. 1. 19.* which he grossly Perverteth, by wresting and corrupting the Text, making it say, what it saith not; for thus he Quotes it, *WHATEVER might be known of God, was manifest within; for God who is Light, hath shewn it unto them.* But the word *Whatever* is neither in the English Translation, nor is there any word in the Greek that can be so Translated. *St. Paul*, in that above quoted place, is not treating of the knowledge of God given to Christians, by special Illumination, in the use of the Scriptures, discovering the great Love of God, by the Redemption of the World, through Jesus Christ, as he gave himself to Dye for us, &c. but of the knowledge of his Eternal Power and Godhead given to the Heathen, by the works of Creation, and the common Illumination given to all Mankind.

What *B. Cool* Quotes out of *W. Pen*'s Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Life, in his seeming praise of the Scriptures, in his 6th page, can be judged no other, but like *Judas*'s Kifs, when he betray'd his Master, and a palpable Contradiction, and Inconsistency both to himself and Brethren, for which they are accountable; but is no argument of my Infincerity, as *B. Cool* doth most falsely and unjustly accuse me. For while he argueth against the Scriptures being the great and only Rule of Faith and Practise, to Christians, with respect to all the peculiar Doctrines and Precepts of Christianity, and gives that Office to the *Light Within*, as common to all Mankind, *Jews, Turks, Heathens, Infidels*; and yet, as it were with the same Breath, extols the Scriptures, calling them *The Blessed Scriptures of Truth*, and that the Quakers most heartily believe them to have been given forth from the same Holy Spirit, and are a declaration of the mind and will of God; and as such, are obliging upon all that have, and can have them, both in reference to Faith and Practise: And we utterly disclaim and renounce all Doctrines and Practises

Practises repugnant to them. He seemes, like some Rebelious Subject, who being accus'd, that he denies the Kings Laws, falls out in high Praises of them, but all this while doth not own them to be the Kings, but sets up other Laws in their place. But seeing *B. Cool* thinks, that *W. Pen* hath said enough in commendation of the Scriptures, to prove *G. Keith* disingenuous, for blaming him for Disputing against their being the Rule, from their Uncertainty, either as to their Original, or Copies, or Translations; all which he hath laboured (as the Papists do to set up their Tradition) to render uncertain, and that they do not determine (without extraordinary Revelation) whether the Papists or Protestants are right about Transubstantiation, or the Socinians and sound Protestants are right about the Trinity. I freely leave it to the Impartial Reader, whether *B. Cool* has not most unjustly blam'd me for Disingenuity; and whether *B. Cool* himself be not sordidly disingenuous and fallacious in this very matter, as well as in other matters hereafter to be treated of.

But further to discover *B. Cool's* gross Ignorance in his way of Arguing against the Scriptures *being the only Rule, exclusive of the Spirit* [to wit from being the Rule] for that (he saith) were to prefer the Effect before the Cause, since the Light (*Christ*) was before the Scripture was, and by him were they given forth, through Holy Men, for our Profit and Edification.

Answer, O rare Logician! As if to distinguish between the Workman and the Rule, Square, or Instrument by which he worketh, were to prefer the Effect (*to wit*, the Rule) to the Cause, *to wit*, to him that useth it, and hath made it for his use. But tho' the Spirit gave forth the Scriptures, and did first reveal the great Truths delivered in them, concerning the Redemption of the World by Jesus Christ, unto certain Holy Men, peculiarly chosen for that work, yet the Spirit was not the Rule even to them, but what the Spirit Reveal'd to them, was the Rule of their Faith, before the Scripture was writ; and what the Spirit thus inwardly Reveal'd to them, as to

Abraham

Abraham, Moses, &c. I grant was the Rule to them, and their primary and only Rule; but that it follows, that that inward Revelation, which they had, was, or is the primary and only Rule to us, is a most false Consequence; unless on the supposition, that we, and all the Christians, as well as Quakers, have the same inward Revelation, in kind, that the Prophets had; and if *B. Cool* will say, they have it, the same in kind, then they have it without Scripture, as *Abraham* and *Moses* so had it. But if they have it not without Scripture, but that their Knowledge and Faith of these great Truths, particularly that one great Truth, That the Son of God was Incarnate, for the Salvation of Men, doth necessarily depend upon the Written Word, as the instrument by which the Spirit doth Illuminate, or Inspire them to Believe, and Understand the Written Word, or Truths declared in Scripture; this is no proof that the Scriptures is not the Rule, *to wit*, The great and only Rule; but is indeed a sufficient and clear proof, that the Scripture is the Rule, and the Spirit is the Ruler, or he that by the Rule, as his Instrument, Rules and Leads our Minds both to Believe the Scripture and Understand it; and also rightly to Apply it for our Edification.

The Doctrine which *W. Pen*, and *B. Cool*, with their Brethren do set up, of making the Spirits Internal Revelation, the Universal and Primary Rule of their Faith and Practice, doth necessarily oblige them to hold also, That all what they Know, or Believe of God, and of Christ, is from the same Internal Extraordinary Revelation and Discovery, in kind, that the Prophets and Apostles had. For according to the Argument I have used above, and recited out of my Book of *Deisme*, against *W. Pen*, if the Internal Revelation that the Quakers have, be the Primary Rule of all the Faith and Knowledge they have of God and Christ, it hath no dependance on the Scriptures, or Written word, so much as an Outward, or External Means; as the Original depends not on the Copy, but the Copy depends on the Original; and this indeed is perfectly agreeing

agreeing with the *Quakers* great Apostle *George Fox*, whom *W. Pen*, and *B. Cool* also, so highly Magnifie; For, saith *G. Fox* in his *Great Mystery*, Page 350. *Ye tell People of an outward ordinary Means, by which Christ communicates the benefits of Redemption.* [Note, By the outward and ordinary Means, they mean the written Word and Sacraments.] *The means of Salvation* (saith he) *is not ordinary, nor outward; but Christ is the Salvation, who is Eternal.* Again, *Great Myst.* p. 133. His Opponent, *T. Moor*, having said, *The Scriptures is the absolute Rule, and Medium of Faith.* In p. 134. *G. Fox* Answereth, *The Scriptures is not the Author, nor the Means of it, nor the Rule, but Christ who gave it, and he increaseth it.* And in p. 243. *Great Myst.* he saith, *And the things of the Gospel, and of the Spirit, are not attained by an External Means.* [Note, Here he doth Exclude the Scripture not only from being the *External Means*, but from being an *External Means* of their Knowledge and Faith.] Again, p. 320. His Opponents having said, *God works Faith in us Inwardly, by the Spirit; and Outwardly, by his Word,* [meaning the written Word.] He Answers, *Here thou goest about to make the Word and the Spirit not one.* Is not the Word Spiritual, and Christ called the Word? Again, p. 168. *Them that never heard the Scripture Outwardly, the Light that every Man hath that cometh into the World, being turned to it, with that they will see Christ; with that they will know Scripture; with that they will be led out of all Delusion, come into Covenant with God; with which they will come to Worship God in the Spirit, and Serve him.* See all these, and many more such Quotations, in my 4th Narrative.

Here we see the Scripture is Excluded from being so much as either the Means, or a Means of the Spirits working Faith or Knowledge in them; and consequently, what Knowledge, or Faith the *Quakers* have of God, or Christ, it must be by inward, immediate, extraordinary Revelation and Discoveries, the same in kind that the Prophets and Apostles had, as such which was without all outward means. Thus we see the Harmony of *W. Pen*, and *B. Cool* and his Brethren, with their great Apostle *G. Fox*. But let us again view their Disharmony and Contradiction, both with themselves, and one with another.

Benjamin

Benjamin Cool, in his 9th pag, saith, *That the Prophets and Apostles had an extraordinary Sight and Sense of Adam's Fall and Christ's Birth, &c. I readily own; but that such an extraordinary Discovery as they had, is absolutely necessary to every Mans Salvation, I deny.* But if he will adhere to his former Assertion, That the *Light Within* is the Primary Rule of every Mans Faith and Knowledge, and to *G. Fox's* Doctrine, above mentioned, every Man that has the true Knowledge and Faith of Christ, must have such an extraordinary Discovery as the Prophets and Apostles had, in kind, if not in degree: For seeing the *Quakers* plead, That the true Knowledge and Faith of God and Christ must be by the Spirit only, without the outward and ordinary Means, as *G. Fox*, their great Apostle, has Taught them; then it must be the same, in kind at least, if not in degree. And if all the Faithful are not come to the same degree of the Spirit that the Prophets and Apostles had, Yet if *B. Cool* will believe their great Apostle, some of the *Quakers*, at least, are come not only to the same degree that the Prophets and Apostles had, who gave forth the Scriptures, but above any degree: For thus he saith expressly, *Great Myst.* p. 318. *For who comes to the Spirit, and to Christ, comes to that which is Perfect; who comes to the Kingdom of Heaven in them, comes to be Perfect, yea, to a Perfect Man; and that is above any Degree.*

But *B. Cool*, in his following Quotation, (as I can understand him, and let the Reader see if he can understand him otherwise) disowns all Extraordinary Discovery, such as the Prophets and Apostles had, in Kind as well as in Degree, and wholly takes to the common and ordinary Discoveries of the *Light Within*, Universally given to all Mankind; for thus he saith expressly, *But that the common and ordinary Discoveries of the Light Within, Universally given to Mankind, (as all Mankind Adheres thereto, and Obeys the same) is that Universal, or General Rule of Faith and Life, we shall, I hope, never deny.* Now this Universal and General Rule, given to all Mankind, *B. Cool*, if he will accord with his Brethren, and particularly with *G. Whitehead* and others, in their Book, call'd, *The Glory of Christ's Light Within*, must hold it to be a full and compleat Rule, that needs no addition, yea, not only needs no Addition, but admits of none; for if it admit of any Addition, then all Mankind have not one and the same Rule of Faith and Practise, contrary to the very scope and design of *W. Pen's* Book, called, *A Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Practise.* But again, If that Addition be but only a Secondary Rule, it presupposeth the Primary Rule, to wit, the *Light Within* them, as Pre-existent, and from which all the Certainty of the Secondary Rule dependeth, and their Primary Rule first giving them the said Discovery,

covery, makes the Secondary wholly superfluous. If it be said, that by the Secondary Men may be led to the Primary, as by the Copy to the Original, or as by the Stream to the Fountain: But what service can the Secondary have to lead them to the Primary, as from the more known, to the more unknown? Seeing the Secondary Rule, which they call the Scripture, has no Certainty but what it receives from the *Light Within*, as it is an Universal Principle common to all Mankind. But common Experience teacheth, That the *Light Within*, i.e. the common Discovery, or Illumination given to all Mankind, that teacheth them some things concerning God as a Creator, and some general Moral Duties to him as such, yet doth not teach them the Knowledge or Faith of God, as he gave his Son to be Incarnate, for the Redemption of the World; for that never was known but by special Revelation, immediately given to the Prophets, and by their means convey'd to others.

B. Cool proceeds to tell us, page 9. what special Veneration he and his Brethren express for the Holy Scriptures, after he hath set up the common and ordinary Discoveries of the Light Within, Universally given to all Mankind, to be the Primary Rule of all Faith and Knowledge: *Yet at the same time, we (saith he) express our Veneration for the Verity and Authority of the Holy Scriptures, since we know them to be (as they are) an Additional, and Unspeakable Benefit for a Rule both of Faith and Life; and such a Rule too, that whatever is Repugnant thereunto, ought not to be of any Authority with us.* But judge, Reader, whether this be not another Judas Kiss; or, as they that Mock'd our Lord with a *Hail Master*. They have a great veneration for the Scriptures, as a Secondary and Additional Rule, but they have a far greater for the Common Discovery given to all Mankind by the Light Within, being the primary Rule: Tho' this primary universal Rule tells them nothing of Christ, as he was outwardly Born of a Virgin, &c. Nor any one of the peculiar Doctrines and Precepts of Christianity; yet, for all that, the common Discovery that Heathens, Jews, Turks, and Infidels have, as well as the Quakers, is the more Excellent and Venerable. The Secondary is but the Servant, or Lackey, to the Primary: The great Truths of the Gospel discover'd by the Holy Scriptures, through the special operation and illumination of the Spirit, not given to Heathens, but only to faithful Christians, must vail, and yeild subjection to the common Dictates of the Light Within, of Moral Justice and Temperance that Heathens have.

Readers, what think you of this sort of Divinity, and deceitful way of shewing his, and their Veneration to the Holy Scripture? But possibly
he

he will say, *Must not Christ, or the Spirit, or God himself, who is within all Men, be preferred to the Scriptures?* And it is Christ they hold to be the primary Rule. But this *Objection* comes from great Ignorance; for neither God, nor Christ, nor the Spirit, can be properly said to be a Rule, or the Rule in any Man, more than a Workman can be said to be the Tool, or Instrument that he works by. God is certainly Greater, and more Excellent than the Scripture, and so is Christ, and the Holy Spirit, so much as the Creator is greater than the Creature: But the Comparifon is not stated betwixt God, or Christ, or the Spirit, and the Scripture, but betwixt the common Illumination given to all Mankind, (which is neither God, nor Christ, nor the Spirit, but their Effect and Operation) and the Scripture, which certainly gives a discovery of all the peculiar Doctrines of the Christian Religion, and Precepts thereof; and there is no need of any other discovery, by way of material Object, but only that the Spirit of God give a Spiritual sight and sense of the Truths of the Gospel already discover'd to us in the Scriptures.

But *Lastly*, How doth this great pretended Veneration, that *B. Cool* seems to have for the Scriptures, agree with the Vile and Contemptible Names that *G. Fox*, the Quakers great Apostle, has given them? who, together with *Richard Hubberthorn*, in the Book, called, *Truths Defence*, did call the Scriptures, page 14, 102. *Earthly, and Carnal, Death, Ink and Paper, Dust and Serpents Meat.*—*And their Gospel is Dust, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, which is the Letter.* And in *Truth's Def.* p. 102. *The Cursed Serpent is in the Letter.* See abundance more of the Quakers Contemptible and Vile Names given to the Scriptures, in my 4th *Nar.* And not only *W. Pen*, but *Joseph Wyeth*, their late Defender, in his *Switch*, chargeth the Scripture with Uncertainty, p. 46.

But *why* (saith *B. Cool* to me in his p. 9.) *George should we, by thee, be rendered so Herodox, for Vindicating the Light Within, both with respect to its Universality and Authority, when thou thy self hast Writ and Printed the same Truths over and over, and to this day are not to be found amongst thy Retractions?*

Answer, I never held the Gross and Absurd Notions of the *Light Within*, asserted by *G. Whitehead* & *W. Pen*, and the generality of the Teachers of the Quakers, viz., *That the Light Within is sufficient to Salvation, without any thing else*, i. e. Not only without the Scriptures, but without the Man Christ, and his Death, and Sufferings, and precious Blood, outwardly shed for us, and his Mediation for us, without us, now in Heaven, all which are some thing else than the *Light Within*. Now that this is the great Offence that the Quakers took against me, *That I held,*

That the *Light Within* is not sufficient to *Salvation*, without something else, is fairly confessed by G. Whitehead, in his *Antidote*, p. 28. And yet he confesseth, that by that somewhat else, I meant the *Man Christ Jesus*, as he outwardly Died for us. Far less did I ever hold that most Absurd and Non-sensical Notion of G. Fox; That the *Quakers* have whole Christ in them, God and Man, Flesh and Spirit, Blood and Bones: And that they have His Flesh in them, because they Eat it, as I have prov'd out of his *Great Myst.* in my 4th Narrative, p. 107. Nor did I ever confound the *Common Illumination* given to Heathens, with the *Special Illumination* given to Christians, as the Quakers generally do, and as I find B. Cool, as well as W. Pendoth: So that I can say, with a good Conscience, I never was guilty of their *Deisme* and *Paganisme*; For I always held in my former Writings, when among the Quakers, That Faith in Christ, God and Man, without us, yet one Christ, is a fundamental Doctrine of Christianity, and so much plainly appeareth from that very Book that B. Cool hath quoted, called the

* Note, Reader, That Book, called, *The Fundamental Truths of Christianity*, was not Publish'd by me, nor was ever intended, by me, to be publish'd in that Imperfect manner; but being found in a Manuscript, unfinish'd, was Publish'd by another, as the Book it self sheweth, without my consent or knowledge, I being then in America. See the Preface.

* *Fundamental Truths of Christianity*, which tho' he quotes as making against me, as my present perswasion is, and for him and his Brethren, yet it makes for me, and against them; for he confesseth, that I said in that Book, [*And I deliver it as one of the Fundamental Truths of Christianity,*] That Christ is come outwardly, as Man, for all. Now seeing he grants that I deliver'd this, as one of the *Fundamental Truths of Christianity*, it necessarily follows, That he who believes not that

Truth, wants a *Fundamental of Christianity*, and is no Christian. But this is quite contrary to G. Whitehead, W. Pen, and B. Cool also, who think Men may be true Christians without this Faith, if they be Moral, Men Just, Meek, and Merciful, &c.

That there is a *Principle of Light* given to all Men, and is in them, I still hold; and that it is given them for that end, that they may become the Children of God, to wit, as by a preparatory operation, as Repentance is preparatory to the Gospel Faith, and Dispensation; and also by way of Concomitancy and Subordination, to a higher Ministrations of Light that is given under the Christian Dispensation, that is special only to Believers in Christ, who have Faith in him, either express, or implicit; I mean in Christ, consider'd as God Man, without us, which I have fully and sufficiently clear'd to any Impartial Reader, in my Book of *Retractions*, p. 13, 19. And therefore B. Cool is the more Unjust to

me

me in this, as in other things, as well as Fallacious, in seeking to deceive his Readers, by making them believe I was of the same Mind with them, in all their Notions and Doctrines of the *Light Within*.

In my Book of *Retractions*, what Unwary, or Unsound Passages I have found in any of my former Books, I have very freely and willingly Retracted; and I thank God, who has given me a Heart so to do; and I pray God, that he may be pleas'd to work the like willingness in the Hearts of all my Adversaries, to Confess and Retract their Errors, as I have done mine: But what of Truth I have writ in any of my former Books, either concerning the *Light Within*, or any other Subject, I Retain, and I hope shall continue so to do, to my dying moment.

And besides my particular Retraction of particular Passages, I have, in my said Book, made a general Retraction of all that is not according to the Doctrine of the Holy Scripture; to which I now add; And of all contrary to the 39 Articles of the Church of England, all which I do Believe to be perfectly agreeable to the Holy Scriptures: Which I hope will satisfy the Moderate and Impartial; but for others, it is in vain for me to endeavour to satisfy them, who will not be satisfied. And notwithstanding the Clamour of my Adversaries against me, of my Unconstancy, and Inconsistency in Principles, would they but give me a fair meeting, before Impartial Witnesses, I could shew much more their Unconstancy and Inconsistency, ten fold, than what they can shew of mine.

The Second thing that *B. Cool* blames me for, both in his Preface and Book, is, for Quoting a Passage in my *Synopsis*, out of *W. Pen's Serious Apology*, p. 146. But that He, [viz. That Outward Person that Suffered at Jerusalem] was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny. This *B. Cool* calls a Juggle; See (saith *B.C.*) the Juggling of this Man! But upon due Examination, the Juggle will be found not to be mine, but his; and that base and fordid. But thus it is, Their Credit of Infallibility is so great a matter with them, like the great *Diana* of the *Ephesians*, that they will commit the greatest and most sordid Equivocation, tho' ever so obvious and apparent, rather than own their Error, as is evident in the present Case. But where is the Juggle? Have I Quoted him wrong? He doth not pretend that I have; for he grants they are *W. Pen's* words. But let us see whether his Gloss on *W. Pen's* words will excuse him; he saith, By the outward Person, he meant no more than Flesh, Blood, and Bones, abstract not only from the Godhead that dwelt in him, but also from the very Soul of Christ, as he was Man: But that this Gloss is a Juggle, will appear from what follows.

First, The Question betwixt *W. Pen* and his Opponent, who was a Presbyterian

Presbyterian Minister in Ireland, was not whether *Flesh, Blood, and Bones*, abstract from the *Godhead* and the *Soul of Christ*, was that outward Person that suffered at *Jerusalem*; for it was not a *Dead and Lifeless Body* that suffered, but a *Living Body*, and such a *Living Body*, that was *Animated* with a *Rational Soul*, the *Noblest* that ever was; and, together with the *Soul*, was *Personally united* to the *Godhead*. And the like Juggle *W. Pen* himself is guilty of, as *G. Whitehead* quotes him, in his *Truths Defence*, p. 72. Thus Defending his Assertion, That he meant, the *Body* which suffered was not properly the entire *Son of God*; But none of his Opponents ever so said, nor do I know that ever any Man did so Assert; and that being no part of the Controversy, cannot be the true meaning of *W. Pen's* assertion.

Secondly, The outward Person doth as necessarily import, and signify both the *Soul* and *Godhead* of *Christ* jointly with the *Body*, as *B. Cool*, who is an outward Person, imports and signifieth both *Soul* and *Body* of *B. Cool*. And if *B. Cool* should borrow, or owe Money, can it be said, That it was only *B. Cool's* *Flesh, Blood, and Bones*, abstractly from his *Soul*, that owes that Money, and should pay the Debt? Our blessed Lord, who was that outward Person, that suffered for us, and paid the debt of our Sins when he Died for us, was not *Flesh, Blood, and Bones*, without his *Soul*, nor without his *Godhead*: Therefore to make such an Abstraction, is a meer Juggle. And by the like Evasion, if I should say, That outward Person *B. Cool*, is not a Man, but a Beast; doth he think that it would excuse me, to say, I meant *B. Cool* abstractly consider'd from his *Rational Soul*, having only a *Sensitive Soul* in him, common to him with the Beasts? And he may as well say, a piece of Wood, abstract from its Length, or Breadth, or Depth, is not a Body: Whereas such an Abstraction is a Contradiction; for we can conceive no Body without its true Dimensions, no more can we conceive a Person without the Parts whereof that person consists. But let *B. Cool* tell us, That outward Person that Suffered, whose Son was he properly? If he was not properly the Son of God, Mary was not a Virgin. To say he was the Son of Mary, as one of *B. Cool's* Brethren lately answered at *Turners-Hall*, was no proper Answer to the Question, but an Evasion; the Question being, not who was his Mother, but who was his Father: And as impertinent to the Question was it to Answer, That he was the Son of David and Abraham; for they were but his remote & mediate Fathers: But I ask *B. Cool*, Who was his Immediate Father as he was Man? If God, then as Man, that very outward Person was the Son of God, as really and properly, and more really and properly,

as

as that Outward Person, called *B. Cool*, was his Fathers Son: Yet not so, that either our Saviours Soul, or Body was any part of the Godhead, but because his Soul and Body, was Personally United to the Eternal Word, Eternally and before all Ages and Creatures, begotten of the Father, and that as Man, he was miraculously Conceived by the Power of the Holy Ghost, and Born of the Virgin *Mary*.

Thirdly, That *W. Penn's* Vile Error and Heresie, and *B. Cools* Juggle, may yet more appear, it is Evident from *W. Penn's* Words in his other Books, that he thinks that outward Person that Suffered at *Jerusalem*, was no part of the true Christ, But that (as he hath affirm'd) he was called Christ, by a Metonymie of the thing containing, getting the Name of the thing contained; as a Vessel that holds Wine, is called Wine, yet this Vessel is no part of the Wine, and that the Body of Christ, is called the Christ, (he saith) that is Metonymically spoken, the thing containing, for the thing contained; see *W. Penns* Rejoynder to *Jo. Faldo*, p. 304. Had he said, it was a Synecdoche, of the part put for the whole, he had spoke as a Christian, but a Metonymy makes the Body (nor yet the Soul) not to be any part of the true Christ. And in his p. 300, he saith, Christ qualified that Body for his Service, but that Body did not constitute Christ, he is Invisible, and ever was so to the Ungodly World, (that was not his Body). By all which it Evidently appears, *W. Penn* did not allow that Visible Body to be any part of him, for a part though it constitutes not the whole altogether, yet in part, it Constitutes the whole, as well as *W. Penn's* Body Constitutes him in part. That the World did not See Christ, with their Spiritual Eyes is granted, as neither do they see his faithful followers; but that they did see him really, and as properly, as ever *B. Cool* saw *W. Penn* with Bodily Eyes, is clear from *John* 6. 36 where *Jesus* said to the Unbelieving Jews, *Ye also have seen me, and believed not*. But *W. Penn*, and *B. Cool*, will be Wiser by that Spirit that is in them, then the holy Spirit that did dictate the holy Scriptures, who calleth him that was Born of the Virgin, the Son of God, the Christ, both God and Man, by Personal Union, and the Holy Scriptures teacheth us no such distinction, as that the outward Person, was not properly the Son of God, but he who dwells in that outward Person; for tho' Christ hath two Natures, yet he has but one Person; it is great Arrogance and Impudence in this *B. Cool*, who is known to be an Ignorant Man, in the knowledge of the strict, and proper Signification of Words, to pretend he knoweth better what the Word Person signifieth, than all the Learned Men, throughout Christendom, and then all the Holy Ancients, who ever held that our Blessed Lord, even considered as a Person without us, because of the Per-

sonal

fonal Union of the two Natures, was properly *the Son of God*, & both *God* and *Man*, as the Scriptures call him, which *B. Cool*, with his Arrogant Ignorance, would teach to Speak more properly; and, as if he were both Wiser than the Holy Men that Pen'd the Scriptures, that never used any such distinction of *Christ within*, that outward Person being properly the Son of God, but that, that outward Person in whom the Son Dwelt, was improperly the Son of God; and also, as if Wiser than all the Holy Ancients, and all the Learned Men now in Christendom, very Magisterially, tells us, in his p. 12. *Nevertheless* (saith he) *Since many People understand not the terms of Proper and Improper, and are apt to Judge of things, according to their Carnal Conceptions; for that reason, I should have been glad the Expression had never been used.* Thus we see how hard they still struggle for their Infallibility; had *W. Penn* uttered that saying, from the Holy Ghost, as *G. Fox* saith, in his *Truth Defended*, p. 104. *Our giving forth Papers, or Printed Books, it is, from the Immediate Eternal Spirit of God*; and in his *Great Myst.* p. 98. *And those, and you, all that Speak and Write, and not from God Immediately and Infallibly, you are all under the Curse*; why should *B. Cool*, have been glad that Expression had never been used? Should he not be glad of all the Words that come from the Holy Spirit? For doubtless, all such are very profitable, and if *B. Cool*, did not think these Words came from the Holy Spirit, by *G. Fox's* Verdict, both *W. Penn*, and *B. Cool*, for all his Lyes, and Fallacies uttered in this his Book, are under the Curse: But *W. Penn*, is not alone in this Vile Heresie, that Christs Body is no part of the true Christ, for *G. Whitehead* is as deep in the Mire as *W. Penn*, who in his *Christian Quaker*, p. 139. 140. telleth us very deliberately, and as he seem'd to himself, very Scholastically; *I distinguish* (saith he) *between Consisting and Having; Christ Had Flesh and Bones, but he did not Consist of them.* This shews the very heart of their Heresie; as a Man hath a Garment, but he doth not Consist of it, it is no part of him.

Now to give my Readers an Instance, that *B. Cool* thinks himself and his Brethren Wiser than the Holy Ancients, in his and their denying *Christ*, as he was *Man*, or that outward Person, to be Properly the Son of God: I will briefly give some Account, who were the Patrons of *W. Penn*, *G. Whitehead*, and *B. Cool*, or at least their Forerunners in maintaining their Vile Heresie: In the time of *Justinian* the Elder, certain Hereticks called *Bonofiani*, from their Master *Bonofus*, denied that *Christ* as *Man*, was the Proper Son of God, and affirm'd that he was his Adopted Son; but were refuted by *Justinian* a Bishop of the *Valensian Church*; who lived about that time: After them about the year 783, *Elipandus*,
and

and *Fælix*, two *Spanish* Bishops, did openly affirm, and Preach, That although *Christ* was the true proper and Natural Son of God, according to his Divine Nature, yet according to his Humane Nature [i. e. his Manhood Nature consisting of Soul and Body] he was only the Son of God by Adoption, and by Grace, but not truly and properly [Behold your Ancestors *W. Pen*, *B. Cool*, and *G. Whitehead*] against whom, *Charles the Great*, called a Synod, at *Frankford*, consisting of three Hundred Bishops, about the year 794, where that Heresie was condemned; as *J. Forbessius* in his Instructions, Hist. Theol. Lib. 6. Chap. 1. N. 1. &c. Gives a full and plain Account; and these Hereticks, as the said Author gives an Account, did make their great Argument against the Flesh of *Christ* [to wit, his Body of visible Flesh, which the Quakers will not have to be any part of him, but a certain invisible Body] for thus they did Argue, *The Flesh, or Humanity of Christ, was not Begotten of the Substance of God, therefore the Man Christ is not, in his Nature, the true and proper Son of God; the which Argument, Paulus the Aquilensian Bishop answereth, and retorteth his Argument against Fælix himself, That the Soul of Fælix was not begotten of his Fathers Seed, and yet the whole Fælix was the true and proper Son of his Father.* And the like Retortion may be made against those Quakers, unless they will say, that the Men whom the World called their Fathers, were not their Fathers, because they did not beget their Souls, but only their Flesh; yet this *B. Cool* thinks himself Wiser than these three Hundred famous Bishops, who condemned this infamous Heresie above eight Hundred years ago.

The Third thing whereof *B. Cool* Accuseth me, both in his Preface and Book, as wronging *W. Pen*, and the Quakers, is, That I have charged him, and them, that the History of *Christs* incarnation was not necessary to our Salvation, or as he explains it himself, p. 5. of his Preface, That Faith in *Christ*, as he Dyed for us, was unnecessary viz. To our Salvation, which he saith, is so very Fallacious and Wicked, that it deserveth no reply. But wherein doth he discover it to be so? I find not that he bringeth one single Instance, in all his Books, effectually proving that *W. Pen* doth hold, that Faith in *Christ* as he Died for us, is necessary to our Salvation; and indeed it is contrary, to the general Drift of all his Books, and especially his whole Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Life, which he will have to be both one and the same, to all Mankind, Heathens and Christians; and this as Perfect, full and Compleat a Rule to the Heathens, who never heard of *Christ*, as to the Christians, and consequently of the same extent, and reveals nothing more to the Christians, then to the Heathens, otherwise it would be less perfect,

or more imperfect, to the Heathens than to the Christians; but he will not allow of any imperfect Rule to be the General Rule, because of their imperfection; he argues against the Scriptures being the Rule,* because the Scriptures were given forth, not all at once, but one part after another, therefore they are not to be the Rule; and he makes it absurd that one Age or part of Mankind should have a more perfect Rule of Faith and Practice than another.

* Discourse
of the General
Rule &c.
p. 24 second
Edition.

I find only one Place which B. Cool doth bring, wherein he deals very Fallaciously to prove that W. Penn holds Faith in Christ, as he Dyed, to be necessary to our Salvation; as in his p. 13. and 14. where he quotes W. Penn, saying, *The outward History of Christs exceeding Love to Mankind, deserves all Humble and Reverend Credit, as a Godly Tradition, and it should for ever Bind Men to Remember, Fear, and Worship him.*

Note, Reader, here is yet not one Word of necessity of Faith in Christ, as he is Man, as well as God, as the Object of our Faith; but let us hear him further: *But a firm belief in him, viz. Christ that so Appeared, Lived, Dyed, Rose and Ascended, both as Testified of in the Scriptures of Truth, and more especially, as he breaks in upon the Soul, in his Divine Discoveries, as the true Light Lightning every ev'ry one coming into the World.* This I call true Christianity, saith W. Pen, tho' this hath a seeming Show, as if W. Pen, meant that Faith in Christ, as he was that outward Person that suffered at Jerusalem, was necessary; yet it is a meer Fallacy, for first, that outward Person that suffered, was not properly the Son of God, as W. Pen hath affirmed, and therefore no proper Saviour, nor Object of Faith. 2dly W. Pen For about 16 Pages in his Rejoinder, argueth against Jo. Faldo, that he who suffered was not properly the Christ, but by a Metonymy he was so called; so that it was not the Outward Person, but he that appeared in that outward Person, viz. *The Light Within that outward Person*, that is the same Light in W. Pen and in all Men, that is the Saviour or object of Faith, properly; he, or that outward Person that Dyed, was not properly, but by a Metonymy, called the Saviour, or Christ, and therefore not properly the object of Faith; which yet will more fully appear, by the passages I have quoted out of his other Books; in his *Quakers a new Nick-Name*, he grants that Quakerism was introduced not by Preaching the Promised Messiah, and by pointing at his Humane Person; but by Preaching a *Light Within*; and that seeing Christ is not to come again in the Flesh, the Quakers need not Preach what is not to be again; and if not needful to be Preached, it Evidently follows, not needful to be believed. His Excuse that they deny not Christ's coming in the Flesh, will not relieve

lieve him, for that's not the question here, but whether Faith in him be necessary to their Salvation? which *W. Penn* opposeth. And though in his rejoinder to *John Faldo*, he grants that the Man *W. Penn's* rejoinder Christ Jesus, Dyed, in *Familiar usage of Speech*, and page 305, 306. *common Phrase*, by the Metonymie of the thing containing, getting the Name of the thing contained; yet he affirms, that, in a more *Mystical Sense*, the Jews who put Christ's Body only to Death, may be also said, in that very Action to have Murdered the Prince of Life and Glory. 1 Cor. 2. Now what this *Mystical Sense* of their killing Christ is, doth appear out of his own and his Brethrens Books, to wit, their killing the Light within, the Seed of the Promise, this he will have to be a *Mystical Death*, and this to be the greater Mystery, *Christ Form'd within*, the work of Regeneration, than God manifest in the Flesh, as he saith expressely in his Preface to *Ro. Barclay's Works*; and this inward Death of Christ, he will have to be the more proper, because the inward Principle, called by him and his Brethren, * *The Seed of the Woman*, that is slain in the Wicked, is properly the Christ, and that Seed is God over all, as he saith in his *Christian Quaker*; the absurdity whereof, I have shewed in my 4th Narative, p. 55, 56. and is so obvious, that the very hearing of it, is enough to make Christian Ears to Tingle; and this *Mystical Sense* of Christ's Death, to wit, the Crucifying Christ within Men, affirmed by *W. Penn*, is a key to us to understand the juggle both of *W. Penn* and *B. Cool*, when he quotes *W. Penn*, that a firm belief in Christ, that so Appeared, Lived, Dyed, [to wit, in his *Mystical Sense* of Death, that is the only proper Death of Christ, as if Christ as God, whom he calls, *The Seed of the Woman*, and an Holy and Spiritual Principle of Light, Life, and Power, could be more properly Killed than as he was Man: Oh Abominable! Rose and Ascended,] is necessary to our Salvation.

*Christ. Quaker, p. 97, 98.

And Note, Reader, that in the very same page of *B. Cool's* Book p. 14. where he brings this juggling Testimony of *W. Penn* to Confirm the juggle, and make it appear, he quotes him further, saying, *And he that obeys this * Light, is a Child of Light, a Child of God, a true Christian.* So this is that, which changeth Man, and Regenerates him, and of a Child of Wrath, makes a Child of Grace, and an Heir of the Promise, saith *W. Penn*, which, saith *B. Cool*, is a bare Historical Faith of Christ's Life, Death, &c. will never do.

* Note, This *W. Penn* and *B. Cool*, thinks Men may do, and yet have no Faith in Christ, come in the Flesh without them, such as the Heathens among the *Indians*, and *Brachmans*, whom they ownto be their Christian Brethren, so that Moral Heathen, and Christian, are but two Names to one Thing.

But whoever said, of all *W. Penn's* or *B. Cool's* Opponents, that a bare Historical Faith would do? not one; therefore this is another Juggle and Fallacie of *B. Cool*, when he excuseth *W. Penn's* saying, *Faith in the History of Christ's outward Manifestation, is a deadly Poison, these Latter Ages has been Infected with*, p. 12. as if *W. Penn*, meant it only, that a bare Historical Faith, without the inward work of Sanctification, were such; which was never the question, nor matter of Controversie between *W. Penn* and *John Faldo*, against whom he there Disputes, or any other of his Opponents, who never said that a bare Historical Faith would or could Save any; yet still their Phrase is unsound and offensive, *That Faith in the History of Christ's outward Manifestation is a deadly Poyson*; for the bare Conviction, of the Truth of the History, and assent to it, which is that Historical Faith he professeth to mean, where no real Sanctification is wrought, is so far from being a *deadly Poyson*, that it hath a real Service, remotely at least, to prepare the Soul for Sanctification; and if many so Convinced, are not Sanctified, as *B. Cool* confesseth in his 16 p. *That Faith will be an Aggravation of their Guilt and Misery, which is therefore no deadly Poyson, but of great Use*, even as Unsanctified Men's having a Conviction of the Light within, and some Sense of it, and that is more than a bare Historical Faith of it, will be an Aggravation of their Guilt; but will *B. Cool* allow Men therefore to call it, a *deadly Poyson*, that infects Hundreds of the Quakers so called, who are no more Sanctified than many others, who have but the Historical Faith of Christ without; and if all *England*, and all Christendom beside, had but a bare Historical Faith of the Light within, without the inward work of Sanctification, that Faith would not Save them; yet it followeth not, according to *B. C.* that the Light within, or a Historical Faith in it, is a *deadly Poyson*. I cannot but think *B. Cool* would think it a great Blessing to all Christendome, and a great Introduction to the Quakers Religion, if they all had a real Conviction, or Historical Faith of the Quakers Notion of the Light within, though all were not Sanctified by it; yet that that Conviction or Faith, is a *deadly Poyson*, I see not how he can Grant: The Quakers, commonly distinguish betwixt Conviction and Conversion; they call that Conviction, or Convincement, when a Man assents to their Great and Fundamental Principle, the *Light within*, which they reckon a Step or Introduction to Conversion, and if Conversion do not follow, yet the Conviction is good; as *Paul* said of the Law, tho' many did not obey it, it was good. And what *B. Cool*, would say in the Case of a general Convincement of the Light within, according to his and his Brethrens Notion of it: I would say
much

much more of a general Convincement all over the World, and all Heathen Nations; that the History of Christ's Birth, Life, Miracles, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, &c. is true, that it would be so far from being a *deadly Poyson*, that it would be a great good, and a great Advantage and Introduction to spread the Christian Religion, over the Heathen Nations. All Christendome, and in a sort all the World, hath a real Notion and Faith of the Light within, as it is an Assent of their Consciences, to the work of the Law, Writ in their Hearts; and this Faith or Assent, is certainly a good thing, and of great Concern to the good of Mankind, being the Foundation of all the good Laws and Governments that are to be found in Heathen Nations, tho' thousands who have it, yet are not Sanctified by it, nor can they be Sanctified by it, without Faith in Christ Crucified, and without a special superadded Illumination, and Operation of the Holy Spirit, that doth usually Accompany the Written Word, according to Gods Ordinary way of working, and the methods of Divine Providence towards the Race of Mankind.

But the Quakers general Notion of the *Light Within* being sufficient to *Salvation without any else*, and confirmed so to be by *G. Whitehead* in his late *Antidote* p. 18. and by *W. Penn* in his *Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Practice*, justified all along by *B. Cool*, and his own saying, as above noted, *That there is but one General Rule of Faith and Practice*, to all Mankind, is such a plain Proof of his Deism, in opposition to the Christian Faith, that greater cannot be given; notwithstanding of what he talks in contradiction and Inconsistency to himself; and *W. Penn* and his other Brethren, p. 27. *That God in his Mercy and Goodness, hath super-added the Holy Scriptures for a Rule to us to walk by, and according to. Yet* (saith he) *we are not therefore to neglect the inward Law and Rule and Eternal Precepts in our Hearts, because we have an outward one to walk by.* Thus he still leaves the true State of the Controversy, on purpose to divert and deceive his Weak Reader, by his juggling. None saith that we ought to neglect the inward Law or Light in the Conscience, of all Mankind; because we have the outward Rule of the holy Scriptures, for true Christians highly Esteem of both, and Labour to conform their Lives to both; but as to all the peculiar Doctrines and Precepts of *Christianity*, as distinct from *Deism* or *Gentile Religion*, however refined they hold the *Rule* of the Christian Faith and Religion, with respect to its peculiar Doctrines and Precepts, to be such a *Rule* as the Heathens have not, and it may be acknowledged to be a *Superadded Rule*, as much as Christian Religion is a *superadded Religion*, to any thing that was or is True in *Gentile Religion*. But for *B. Cool*, and his Brethren,

Brethren, who own but one *general Rule and Practice, to all Mankind*: And say the *Light within every Man* is sufficient to *Salvation, without any thing else*. [Let him deny this if he dares] to talk of a superadded Rule, is a Contradiction and Inconsistence: For if they allow a Rule superadded to the common Illumination, obliging Christians to believe and practice any more things than what the Heathens are obliged to, they make two Rules; one common to Christian and Heathens, viz. *The Light Within*; the other peculiar to the Christian, which is of a far greater Perfection, and hath a far greater Number of things both to be believed and practised, and of a higher Nature, many or most of them, than what the common Illumination in the Consciences of Mankind generally Teacheth.

And as Concerning what *B. Cool* Grants of *Gods Superadding the Holy Scriptures, for a Rule to us to walk by*. I ask him, Was that Superadded Rule, absolutely necessary to be added to our Christianity, through our Faith and Obedience to it? If he say it was and is, then he contradicts their *Fundamental Notion of the sufficiency of the Light Within all Mankind to Salvation, and all Mens having but one general Rule, his own Words*. If it be not absolutely necessary, what need of it's being superadded, seeing the common illumination hath a sufficiency in it abundantly (according to the Quakers) not only to inform the Understanding of all things necessary to Salvation, without any super-added Rule, but of Grace to enable all Mankind perfectly to obey all Gods Commands; and to attain to a Sinless Perfection, and that in a much nearer way, and with fewer means, as having fewer and easier Precepts; for who can deny but the Laws and dictates of the Common Illuminations given to all Mankind are much fewer, and easier to be obey'd, than what the Christian Religion Superadds; for it cannot be proved that the Common Illumination, without the superadded Law of Christianity, forbids *Poligamy*; but the Law of *Christianity* forbids it: And many other things the *Christian Religion* both Commands and Forbids, which the common Illumination doth neither command nor forbid, tho in the Substance of the Ten Commandments, commonly called the Moral Law, both the Rules agree. Again, this *Superadded Law* of the Holy Scriptures, *B. Cool* will not allow it to be any other than *Secondary*, compared with the common illumination, as the Copy is to the Original which is the *Primary*, and as the Copy has nothing but what the original hath, and is better and more *Authentick* in the Original, than in the Copy; and the Original has no dependence on the Copy, but the Copy has on the Original; from all which it is very plain, whatever the Scriptures Teach or Dictate, that the common Illumination in the Conscience doth not first and originally dictate, is of no further Obligation, upon any Men; for the *Secondary* binds only

by the force and Authority of the *Primary*, and hath all its certainty and Evidence therefrom, as *W. Penn* doth argue in his *Discourse of the general Rule of Faith and Practice*; where he prefers the inward Illumination common to all Mankind, to the Scriptures; affirming the first to be the Rule for it's Perfection, certainty, Evidence, Plainness, Antiquity, Universality, and many other Reasons, and for all which Reasons he Rejects the Scriptures from being the *Primary* Rule; yet is so kind to allow them to be the *Secondary* in diverse things, *viz.* So far as the common Illumination is Commensurate to the Scriptures, which is only but in a small part; and for the rest of them, the common illumination hath nothing about them, as whether True or False, further than the Ten Precepts of the Decalogue.

But that *W. Pen*, and *B. Cool* also confesseth, that the Quakers have no Extraordinary Revelation, (*i. e.*) Special and Peculiar, Concerning Christ's Incarnation, Birth, Death, Resurrection, &c. See *B. Cool*, his page 20. *B. Cool* and *W. Penn*'s Citation of *Calvin*, is a meer Juggle of both, and a notorious perversion of *Calvin*'s Words, as I have shown in my Book called, *W. Pen*'s Deism; for that *Calvin* asserteth the necessity of the inward Motion or Influence of the holy Spirit, to persuade us that the Scriptures are true, is no Argument that *Calvin* thought the Spirit, or Light Within, to be the Rule, as I have shewed in that Book of *Deisme*.

To the quotations of *W. Pen*'s saying, in his *Address to Protestants*, *What is Christ but Meekness, Justice, and Mercy, Patience, Charity and Virtue, in Perfection?* He objects, p. 32. *That I purposely left out the last Word, viz. In Perfection*, and for this uncharitable supposition, he charges me to be a Sophister, & guilty of Envy and Malice, as if I did represent *W. Pen*, to have dwindled away Christ to nothing but a Habit. But I answer, I did not omit purposely the word *in Perfection*, as he doth uncharitably charge me, for that half Sheet of mine, called the *Synopsis* of *W. Penn*'s *Deisme*, being but an *Index* of my Book of *Deisme*, and some other quotations I had extracted out of *W. Penn*'s Printed Books; I had no need to put down his words at large, for I put down all that was necessary to show his *Deisme*, and the words *in Perfection*, I have put them in my 3d. Narrative, for which see page 8. of my 3d. Narrative, which was printed a year before my *Synopsis*. Nor doth the Word *in Perfection*, when added, help *W. Pen*, or *B. Cool*, out of the Mire of *Deisme*, for who can doubt but the Habits of Vertue in perfect Men, who are come to a sinless Perfection, are perfect, as *B. Cool* and his Bretheren's Principle, obliges them to believe? But supposing that by *Meekness, Mercy, Justice, Patience, Charity, in Perfection*, *W. Pen* did mean not any Habits of Virtue, however

however perfect in Men, but the *Essential Perfections of Christs Godhead*, which may be said to be, *Justice, Goodness, Mercy, Charity, in Infinite Perfection*, yet the Consequence that *W. Penn* draws from this, as it is weak, and false, to prove that a Meek or meer just Man is a Christian, so it is strong enough to prove *W. Penn* a meer Deist; for though *Christs Godhead is Infinite Goodness, Justice, Charity*, as *St. John* describes *God to be Love*; yet *Christ is not only God, but Man also*; and that Faith that denominates a Man to be a true Christian, must be a *Faith in Christ, not as God only, but as both God and Man*. Which Faith must be a living Faith, that hath good Works; but against this Faith *W. Penn* argues, as not necessary to make a Man a true Christian, and by a false Consequence, doth Inferred, that he who believes in God, believes in Christ, because Christ is God; as if Christ were God only, and not Man also.

Thus Reader I have made good my three Charges against *W. Penn* and *B. Cool*, [and the Truth of my *Synopsis*] which he calls the three Pillars of my whole Fabrick; and supposing it were so, seeing they are firm, the Fabrick must be firm also.

I shall not further enlarge in Answer to his Book at present, judging it needless, but refer to my other Books, especially my 4 Narratives, my Book called the Deisme of *W. Penn*; which *B. Cool* ought to Answer throughout, if he thinks to clear *W. Penn* of Deisme; where his and his Brethrens Deisme and Antichristian Principles are sufficiently discovered, and whereof the *Synopsis* was but as an Index. And that other called the Fallacies of *W. Penn* and his Brethren, in their Answer to the Bishop of *Cork*.

As to the Airy Flouts and Scoffs, throughout his Book and Preface, more *Ismael-like*, than a Sober Heathen, and some base Insinuations against me, in p. 11. and 12. of his Preface, being as False as Foolish, I think not worth Noticing.

But I dare him to make good his charge against me in any of these particulars, which if he offers to do, I doubt not but I shall thereby the more discover his Falshood and Folly.

As for the *Bristol* Quakers Reasons why they met me not, to Answer to my Charges against their Antichristian Principles, then Read and Proved against them, out of the Books of their most approved Authors, at the Baptists Meeting-House the 24th of July, 1699. They being in effect no other than what the Quakers of London gave, why they refused to meet me at *Turners-Hall* the 11th. of January 1699. I refer to the Postscript of my 4th Narrative, Printed 1700, where they are sufficiently answered. But the only effectual Reason, they both have omitted, which was, that of a Guilty Conscience, knowing in themselves that they are really chargeable with those things.

But whereas they say, *I was not ashamed Hypocritically to profess my self a Quaker, as I had done ever since I came to the City*, is a Notorious Untruth: When by Violence they kept me out at their Meeting-House-Door, some of them ask'd me, *If I was a Quaker? I said I was a Friend of Truth*, but did not say I was a Quaker. If to gain some of the Quakers from their Heathenism and Antichristianity, (as God hath been pleased to make me Instrumental to gain some,) I was for some time in some outward Behaviour like them, as *St. Paul* said, to the Jews, he was as a Jew; and to the Gentiles, as a Gentile; this will not prove me a Hypocrite; as it proveth not that *St. Paul* was such.

